CCD/PV.453
26 February 1970
ENGLISH

CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

CONF PUBLS DEPT

FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FOUR HUNDRED AND FIFTY-THIRD MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 26 February 1970, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. I.F. PORTER (United Kingdom)

(Previous verbatim records in this series appeared under the symbols ENDC/PV.1-ENDC/PV.430).

70-35297

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Argentina:	Mr. C. ORTIZ de ROZAS
	Mr. V.E. BERASATEGUI
Brazil:	Mr. R.E. SARAIVA GUERREIRO
	Mr. P. CABRAL de MELLO
	Mr. L.F. PALMEIRA LAMPREIA
Bulgaria:	Mr. K. CHRISTOV
	Mr. T. PETROV
	Mr. D. STAMBOLIEV
	Mr. I. PEINIRDJIEV
Burma:	U CHIT MYAING
	U MAUNG MAUNG GYI
Canada:	Mr. G. IGNATIEFF
	Mr. R.W. CLARK
	Mr. J.R. MORDEN
Czechoslovakia:	Mr. T. LAHODA
	Mr. J. STRUCKA
	Mr. J. CINGROS
Ethiopia:	Mr. A. ZELLEKE
Hungary:	Mr. I. KOMIVES
	Mr. J. PETRAN
	Mr. I. SARKADI
India:	Mr. M.A. HUSAIN
	Mr. N. KRISHNAN
	Mr. K.P. JAIN
Italy:	Mr. R. CARACCIOLO
	Mr. F.L. OTTIERI
	Mr. R. BORSARELLI
	Mr. U. PESTALOZZA

Japan:	Mr. I. ABE
	Mr. H. OTSUKA
	Mr. Y. TSUZUKI
	Mr. J. SAKAMOTO
Mexico:	Mr. A. GARCIA ROBLES
	Mr. M. TELLO
Mongolia:	Mr. M. DUGERSUREN
	Mr. D. ERDENBILEG
Morocco:	Mr. M.A.A. KHATTABI
	Mr. M.H. NASSAR
Netherlands:	Mr. H.F. ESCHAUZIER
	Mr. E. BOS
Nigeria:	Mr. C.O. HOLLIST
Pakistan:	Mr. K. AHMED
	Mr. S.A.D. BUKHARI
	Mr. T.O. HYDER
Poland:	Mr. W. NATORF
	Mr. K. ZYBYLSKI
	Mr. H. STEPOSZ
	Mr. R. WLAZLO
Romania:	Mr. I. DATCU
	Mr. O. IONESCO
	Mr. V. PARASCHIV
	Mr. C. GEORGESCO
Sweden:	Mrs. A. MYRDAL
	Mr. A. EDELSTAM
	Mr. R. BOMAN
	Mr. J. LUNDIN

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:	Mr. A.A. ROSHCHIN
	Mr. V.V. SHOUSTOV
	Mr. L.A. MASTERKOV
	Mr. V.B. TOULINOV
United Arab Republic:	Mr. O. SIRRY
	Mr. E.S. EL REEDY
	Mr. M. ISMAIL
United Kingdom:	Mr. I.F. PORTER
	Mr. W.N. HILLIER-FRY
	Mr. J.T. MASEFIELD
	Mr. R. HOULISTON
United States of America:	Mr. J.F. LEONARD
	Mr. A.F. NEIDLE
	Mr. W. GIVAN
	Mr. R.L. McCORMACK
Yugoslavia:	Mr. M. BOZINOVIC
	Mr. M. VUKOVIC
Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General:	Mr. W. EPSTEIN

1. The CHAIRMAN (United Kingdom): I declare open the 453rd plenary meeting of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

2. Mr. CARACCIOLO (Italy) (interpretation from French): The statements made by the representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union at the beginning of this new session testify to the will of these two great nuclear Powers to pursue their efforts in order to reach positive results in the fields they indicated. Moreover, the composition of the Conference has been reinforced this year over that which existed at the beginning of the previous session by the presence of the new countries which joined us in July and August last. We then welcomed this enlargement, which gives the Committee a better-balanced geographical representation and reflects the polycentric nature of today's world. I am sure that the presence among us of the new members from Asia, Africa, South America and Europe will give greater force and scope to the work of the Conference, to the great benefit of the common effort.

3. This increase makes us regret all the more that France's place is still unoccupied. It seems to us, however, that present needs could give us hope for a change of attitude by the French Government.

4. The focal points of conflagration spread about the world are in fact always alight, and, despite the restraint and the efforts made by certain Powers to control them, the risk remains that at any moment a spark stronger than the others may set the powder alight. On the other hand, the simultaneous growth of military power in the world, due to technological progress and to the increase in expenditure on armament, makes this risk more and more terrifying. The Secretary-General of the United Nations (CCD/PV.450, para.10), the representative of the United States (CCD/PV.449, paras. 15, 35), and the representative of Mexico (ibid., paras. 95, 96), gave us at the beginning of this session of the Conference striking figures and details of the increase of military budgets in the world and of the shocking disproportion between the astronomical sums devoted to those budgets and those spent on certain activities vital to humanity. Other delegations during later meetings produced other figures and statistics which add to the picture of this paradoxical situation.

(Mr. Caracciolo, Italy)

5. For all these reasons I wish to address, in the name of the Italian Government, an appeal to the French Government to consider the possibility of resuming its place in this Conference at the side of the other member countries. I hope that France, which has never grudged its co-operation in work for peace, will no longer refuse to associate itself with the efforts of the other nuclear and non-nuclear countries represented at the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. If criticisms can be made of the methods followed by our Conference and of the results it has obtained so far, it seems to us that the most effective way of remedying the insufficiencies which one deplores is actually to share within this Conference in its work and bring to it the valuable contribution of the specific qualities peculiar to each country.

6. On the resumption of its work in Geneva the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament has before it a number of resolutions on disarmament voted by the General Assembly of the United Nations during its twenty-fourth session (CCD/275). These resolutions, as well as the debates which preceded them in the First Committee, testify to the great interest which the supreme organ of the United Nations accords to the problems which our Conference is to consider.

7. Simultaneously, the expectations of public opinion have been revived by the decision of the United States and the Soviet Union to engage in bilateral talks on the limitation of strategic arms. The Italian Government, for its part, expresses its best wishes for the success of these talks, which are of great importance also for the subsequent development of the work of our Conference. After the phase of preliminary contacts in Helsinki, there will next be a more sustained phase of the Soviet-American conversations, which prompts the hope that the dialogue now begun may finally stop the nuclear arms race between the two great Powers and help the establishment between them of greater mutual confidence which will consolidate nuclear balance and peace in the world. We hope that these two almost parallel negotiations, between the members of this Conference and between the two great nuclear Powers, may as a result of a direct or indirect exchange of influences, rightly emphasized in the statement of the representative of the United States (CCD/449, paras. 18 et seq.), may exert increasingly beneficial effects on one another.

8. Throughout the last session the Italian delegation stressed the need to maintain a balance between the different measures of disarmament and the so-called collateral

(Mr. Caracciolo, Italy)

measures, and pressed for the maintenance of an over-all view of the means suitable for reaching the final goal which is the reason for the creation and the very existence of this Conference.

9. The representative of Mexico recalled, in his statement on 17 February (ibid., para.69), that the three sources of General Assembly resolution 2602 E (XXIV) were, first, the suggestion made by the delegation of Romania on 3 April 1969 (ENDC/PV.400, paras. 80-81), then the proposal in the Introduction to the annual report of the Secretary-General (A/7601/Add.1, paras. 42 et seq.), and thirdly the suggestion of the delegation of Italy contained in the working document of 21 April of last year (ENDC/245) and aimed at establishing an organic programme of disarmament. This resolution, approved by the General Assembly by a large majority, specifically requests the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament -

> "to work out, while continuing intensive negotiations on collateral measures, a comprehensive programme dealing with all aspects of the cessation of the arms race and general and complete disarmament under effective international control".

10. In the complex, confused and extremely dangerous situation which exists in the world today, our peoples must be given something which will help them to re-establish a certain degree of confidence, something which will prevent the disillusionment of the young and the despair of the old from becoming inordinate. In the field of disarmament nothing can better inspire that confidence, which is just as necessary for peoples as is faith in the heart of every man, than the hope of achieving within a reasonable time a situation whereby each nation, turning back on the road it had followed, will begin to reduce its military power by one soldier, by one artillery piece. The attention which the world's Press gave to the resumption of our work bears witness to the hopes which are placed in the work of this session which coincides with the beginning of the seventies.

11. The declaration of the Disarmament Decade by the General Assembly of the United Nations (resolution 2602 E (XXIV)), the importance and earnestness of which the Secretary-General of the United Nations emphasized by coming personally to Geneva and bringing us a message which was highly appreciated (CCD/PV.450), cannot be simply an exercise in pure rhetoric, for that would undermine the prestige that our Committee has been able to achieve in the opinion of the world and shake the confidence it inspires in other international organizations. Therefore the mountains must not give birth to a

(Mr. Caracciolo, Italy)

mouse -- parturiunt montes, nascetur ridiculus mus -- but on the contrary, the declaration of the Disarmament Decade must achieve concrete significance. Towards this aim paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 2602 E (XXIV) seems to indicate to us a definite path.

12. Most of the speakers who have preceded me have advocated the urgent resumption of work for general and complete disarmament and have stressed the need to tackle the detailed programme requested by the United Nations. Consequently we are witnessing the existence in this respect of considerable agreement, which will probably grow as successive delegations make their general statements, and since in the past the expressed measure of agreement has underlain numerous decisions of our Committee, it cannot be denied proper consideration in the present case.

13. The problem facing us today is therefore to pass from the stage of general affirmations to that of concrete realization. It is a considerable problem and one whose solution will take a considerable time; its difficulties should not lead us to adopt an ostrich-like policy, but on the contrary to make a sustained effort to achieve possible solutions.

14. What has perhaps handicapped us so far has been the fear of becoming somewhat abstract in elaborating theories having little to do with political realities, and the other fear of ranging over an almost philosophical field and leaving aside the achievement of possible concrete measures. I am convinced that by taking those two dangers into account and by steering between Scylla and Charybdis we should be able to achieve a fairly flexible programme, to begin the consideration of various measures of disarmament in a fairly logical way, and to forecast realistically the possibility of achieving within a fairly reasonable time the beginning of the phase of effective disarmament.

15. I should like nevertheless to recall that the establishment of such a programme is more than the preparation of a simple priority list of the matters for consideration. The General Assembly resolution has stated that the programme should cover "all aspects" of the problem. The representative of Sweden in her statement of 18 February (CCD/PV.450), and the representative of the Netherlands in his very useful working paper of 24 February (CCD/276), which was accompanied by lucid and interesting explanations (CCD/PV.452, paras. 66 et seq.), have referred to some of them; but there are many others. We have a long and difficult operation before us, which requires a

(Mr. Caracciolo, Italy)

pragmatic approach and, at the same time, imaginative efforts. This work must, in our opinion, start from a certain number of simple criteria round which it should be fairly easy to form a common opinion which would grow more and more substantial and finally become the object of negotiations and firm commitments by all countries. It is necessary above all to find the method of work most appropriate for achieving this grand design.

16. I should like in this connexion to say that, though the existence of the draft treaties on general and complete disarmament presented in 1962 by the co-Chairmen (ENDC/2/Rev.1 and ENDC/30 and Add.1-3) is certainly encouraging and may be a starting point for the new work of the Conference, we must carefully avoid those causes which in the past have brought the consideration of those plans to a halt. One of those causes was perhaps excessive optimism at the start. It was believed then that general and complete disarmament could be achieved through the negotiation of a single treaty. It was hoped that a single legal and political instrument could cover the implementation of linked phases until the ultimate objective of general and complete disarmament was reached. The plans provided, moreover, that the process would begin directly with a reduction in arms and armed forces. That was perhaps not the only cause of the halt in negotiations on general and complete disarmament; but it is enough to induce us to resume consideration of the problem today with greater circumspection and to take all necessary precautions in order that the process may not be halted a second time.

17. I therefore think that, in order to follow up the United Nations resolution and formulate the programme which is requested of this Committee by the majority of public opinion, in this first phase of our session an intensive period should be provided for an exchange of views between all the delegations concerned in order to establish the quintessence of the problem, establish a certain convergence of view on the starting-points, and at the same time to reach a certain agreement on semantics. Certainly the setting-up of a working party to meet regularly would considerably facilitate the continuity of these exchanges of view without in any way affecting the negotiations in the full Committee on specific and collateral measures. I do not advocate this suggestion to the exclusion of all others. If the Conference believes that the setting-up of a working party open to all delegations concerned, which could in their turn enlist,

(Mr. Caracciolo, Italy)

where necessary, the help of experts of their choice, would raise difficulties -- which I frankly confess I cannot see --, other less official means could equally well be sought, provided always that the exchanges of view between delegations could proceed without interruption.

18. I do not wish today to forecast too precisely the duration of this first phase of the exchanges of views, which I would term exploratory and which might roughly correspond to the first part of our session. Permit me, however, to insist on the need to establish now the moment for the start of the second phase, during which the Committee could begin to consider this important problem at its official plenary meetings. We believe that the date chosen for the discussion at plenary meetings of the Committee of the result of the preliminary exchanges of view must leave us sufficient time to accomplish useful work before the end of this session.

19. This leads me to make another remark, on procedure. If our Committee is to carry out during the present session all the work asked of it by the various United Nations resolutions, the discussion of the items must follow a specific order and not merely develop haphazard. I should therefore like to submit a suggestion to the co-Chairmen: that once the general statements have been concluded, the debate on the various items -- among which I include, of course, general and complete disarmament -- should be arranged in advance according to an approximate time-table so that each delegation can concentrate with the greatest efficiency on each item as it is discussed in its turn. It would be most regrettable if, owing to lack of effort and imagination or because of a general fear of the difficulties, which could probably be overcome more easily than seemed possible at first sight, the Committee were to miss the opportunity of playing the part the whole world expects of it.

20. The stress put on this over-all view of our problems in no way decreases the interest of the Italian delegation in the pursuit of discussions and negotiations on several specific problems before us. In proposing a particular method for the study of a more general and particularly complex problem, we do not wish to distract the attention of the Committee for a single instant from the current negotiations, which we wish to pursue simultaneously.

21. In particular, to begin with collateral nuclear measures, we very much hope that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament can arrive as quickly as possible at an agreement on a comprehensive nuclear test ban and on prohibition of the production of

(Mr. Caracciolo, Italy)

fissionable material for military purposes. An agreement banning the production of fissionable material for military purposes, signed by the Powers possessing nuclear weapons, would balance and reinforce the commitment accepted by the non-nuclear Powers under the non-proliferation Treaty (ENDC/226*), namely not to construct nuclear arms or other explosives with the fissionable material they possess for peaceful purposes.

22. We know that the non-proliferation Treaty constitutes the first bastion against the pursuit of the nuclear arms race because it seeks to prevent either an unlimited increase in the nuclear arsenals existing in the world through horizontal proliferation or an increase in the number of States possessing nuclear weapons. But for that aim to be achieved it is not enough for the Treaty to come into force as soon as possible, which is our ardent hope. It is necessary also to implement the policy which inspires the Treaty and with which the Italian Government co-operates wholeheartedly. That policy goes beyond the commitments laid down in articles I and II of the Treaty and also implies the duty to ensure the conditions necessary fully to justify the choice made by the States not possessing nuclear weapons.

23. The success of the policy of non-proliferation therefore depends to a large extent on the achievement of the other objectives set out in articles IV, V and VI of the Treaty, especially increased international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. In that connexion we have noted with interest the communiqué of the co-Chairmen on the recent conversations in Moscow, and the beginning of new disarmament negotiations of wider scope. In this latter field new negotiations aimed at extending to all States the restrictions that the non-proliferation Treaty imposes on a single category of States ought to begin as soon as possible; only thus can the disequilibrium resulting from the Treaty be remedied and at the same time the policy of non-proliferation be made permanently irreversible by linking it to the process of halting the armaments race and reducing military arsenals.

24. But whereas the cessation of the arms race represents the primary objective of the non-proliferation Treaty, it is necessary at the same time to prevent the emplacement of nuclear arms in other media. That is why we have today, at the head of our work programme, the draft treaty prohibiting the emplacement of nuclear arms and other arms of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and the subsoil thereof (CCD/269/Rev.1). That draft treaty has as precedents the Treaty on the denuclearization of outer space (General Assembly resolution 2222 (XXI)) and the

(Mr. Caracciolo, Italy)

Antarctic Treaty[1]. We sincerely hope that the negotiations based on the draft submitted by the two co-Chairmen, which have already advanced so favourably, may soon lead to a satisfactory agreement.

25. I should now like to refer briefly to another item which will still be a subject of negotiation within the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament at the present session: the problem of banning and, if possible, destroying chemical and biological arms, concerning which two separate draft conventions (ENDC/255/Rev.1, A/7655) have been submitted.

26. The work of the Conference in this field has been encouraged and stimulated by the recent announcement of President Nixon that the United States has unilaterally renounced the production and use of toxins. This decision is all the more significant because it follows another decision on the more general subject of the use of biological weapons, also announced by President Nixon on 25 November 1969.

27. The Italian delegation followed with attention and interest, during the work of our Conference last year, the initiative of the United Kingdom delegation for the banning of biological means of warfare. We have always been in favour of the main objectives of the United Kingdom proposals, but we still had some doubts of the effectiveness of certain provisions of these, and expressed them at the unofficial meeting held on 30 July 1969. Most of them have since been removed by the clarifications provided by the United Kingdom delegation and the studies carried out by our competent services. I am very happy, therefore, to be able today to support the British initiative.

28. Nevertheless, I should like at the same time to recall the position adopted by the Italian delegation at the United Nations General Assembly in favour of a reinforcement of the Geneva Protocol of 1925 (A/7575, p. 117), which we continue to consider a basic instrument in this field. We believe that, to extend the geographical scope of that Protocol and make it more universal, the States parties to the Treaty could make an effective gesture by withdrawing their earlier reservations of the right to use arms banned by the Protocol against non-signatory States, where these have not themselves violated the provisions of the Protocol.

1/ United Nations Treaty Series, Vol. 402, p. 71.

(Mr. Caracciolo, Italy)

29. Lastly, I should like to express the opinion that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament might well follow in the preparation of its future work the example set by the Latin-American States when they adopted the Treaty of Tlatelolco (ENDC/186) denuclearizing their continent. That Treaty could provide a model for the creation of other nuclear-free zones, not in outer space or under the seas and oceans but in those parts of the world where the necessary conditions existed.

30. In conclusion, the considerations I have put forward and the suggestions I have made in this statement, in which I have been able to deal with only a small part of the problems which concern us, are dictated by the conviction that this year more than ever the task before our Conference presents, by its very complexity, a challenge which we must at all costs take up. If it is true that the survival of nations depends on the answer that they give to the challenges of history at every turn, then the vigour and the vitality of organizations such as ours will undoubtedly be judged by the way they have stood up to the needs of the hour.

31. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): In my intervention of 17 February I took the liberty of analysing four of the questions referred to the Committee which, for the reasons that I then explained, appeared to us to deserve attention in priority (CCD/PV.449, paras.67 et seq.)

32. I should like today to deal very briefly with another question which also appears on our programme of work, namely that of nuclear-free zones. The establishment of such zones is undoubtedly an effective measure of nuclear disarmament. It necessarily implies, in fact, the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons in the territories of all States parties to the treaty under which the zone is established. The reason why I did not include this question in the summary review I gave in my earlier intervention was not that I do not attach sufficient importance to it, but rather that for the creation of any such zone, as is well known, the consent of States whose territories will be encompassed in the zone is an essential prerequisite. This situation has unfortunately not yet arisen except in Latin America, as the representative of Sweden pointed out last week (CCD/PV.450, para.48) in terms for the generosity of which, as a national of one of the countries in that part of the new continent, I wish to express my thanks. I likewise express our thanks to the representative of Italy, who also has just commended the Treaty of Tlatelolco (ENDC/186).

(Mr. García Robles, Mexico)

33. That is why, in dealing with this question, I think I ought to confine myself to considering some of the more pertinent aspects of the only nuclear-free zone which exists in territories densely populated by man -- that is, the nuclear-free zone established by the Treaty on the prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America, the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

34. In this connexion, and to supplement the information provided by my delegation at the meetings of the Committee held on 3 July (ENDC/PV.416, paras.47-49) and 9 September (CCD/PV.435) of last year and in the working paper CCD/268 of 15 September 1969, I should like to add that both the Final Act of the preliminary meeting for the constitution of the Organization for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (REOPANAL) and a collection of all the resolutions adopted at the first part of the first session of the General Conference of that organization (OPANAL) have been reproduced as documents of the General Assembly of the United Nations bearing the symbols A/7639 of 28 August 1969 and A/7681 of 23 September 1969, which will facilitate consultation of them in any of the official languages of the Organization.

35. I should like also to inform the members of the Committee that the number of States parties to the Treaty -- which are automatically members of OPANAL -- has grown to fifteen, Guatemala having joined on 6 February of this year the fourteen States listed in the two documents I have just mentioned which had already deposited their instruments of ratification and declarations of total waiver of requirements under article 28 of the Treaty.

36. Lastly, it is also desirable to point out that the United Kingdom, the Government of which deposited on 11 December 1969 its instrument of ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty, has become the first nuclear-weapon State party to the Protocol. I would add that on the same date the United Kingdom became party to Additional Protocol I. I would not wish to let this opportunity pass without reiterating to the representative of the United Kingdom the great appreciation of the Government of my country -- which I have already had the opportunity to express in the First Committee of the General Assembly and which I am sure also reflects the sentiments of the other States parties to the Treaty of Tlatelolco -- of this new gesture designed to facilitate the achievement of the noble aims of the Treaty.

(Mr. García Robles, Mexico)

37. Similarly, we feel that this is the moment to recall that ratification of Additional Protocol II, to which I have just referred, has been the subject of two resolutions of the General Assembly of the United Nations and of one of the Conference of Non-Nuclear Weapon States. In this last resolution, resolution B, the Conference laid particular stress on its conviction that "for the maximum effectiveness of any treaty establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone, the co-operation of the nuclear-weapon States is necessary", and moreover stressed that this "co-operation should take the form of commitments likewise undertaken in a formal international instrument which is legally binding, such as a treaty, convention or protocol" (A/7277, p.5). In the three resolutions of which I have been speaking -- the other two being General Assembly resolutions 2286 (XXII) and 2456 B (XXIII)-- the nuclear-weapon Powers were urged in almost identical terms "to sign and ratify as soon as possible Additional Protocol II of the Treaty of Tlatelolco".

38. Furthermore the General Assembly, in its resolution 2499 A (XXIV)/Rev.1 adopted during its last session on 31 October and entitled "Celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations", agreed to address an appeal --

> "... to all Member States to give urgent consideration to the ratification of, or accession to, a number of multilateral instruments which have been adopted, endorsed or supported by the United Nations".

In this connexion it should be noted that among the antecedents of this resolution is the list transmitted by the Secretary-General to States Members in document A/7712, in section III of which is included under item 3 Additional Protocol II of the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

39. Let us hope that the nuclear Powers which have not yet done so -- and which unfortunately are in a majority, since Additional Protocol II has been ratified by only one of them, the United Kingdom, as I informed the Committee a few moments ago, and signed by only one more, the United States -- will decide to heed the appeal of the General Assembly which I have just mentioned and which strengthens its many earlier exhortations.

(Mr. García Robles, Mexico)

40. Many reasons could be adduced in favour of the nuclear Powers making without delay the contribution once again requested of them by the body authorized to represent the international community. Among these reasons I will select the following by way of example:

41. First, through the Treaty of Tlatelolco there already exists today in the world a nuclear-free zone embracing territories covering an area of about six million square kilometres and containing a population of about one hundred million, both of which will grow as the number of States parties to the Treaty increases.

42. Second, on 2 September 1969 there was established in the City of Mexico the Organization for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (OPANAL), at a solemn ceremony which the Secretary-General of the United Nations, U Thant, honoured with his presence and at which he said among other things that in a world which often seems dark and ominous the Treaty of Tlatelolco will shine like a beacon; that it surpasses in the scope of its prohibitions and provisions for control the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (ENDC/226*), and that the creation of the zone is fully in accordance with the Purposes and Principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

43. Third, the obligations that Additional Protocol II of the Treaty entails for the nuclear Powers are in substance no more than the application to a specific or concrete case of the obligations assumed under the United Nations Charter, since they are limited to an undertaking to respect "the status of denuclearization of Latin America in respect of warlike purposes" and "not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against the Contracting Parties of the Treaty" (ENDC/186, p.32).

44. The fourth and last example I want to give is this. Three years have already elapsed since both the Treaty and its Additional Protocols were opened for signature on 14 February 1967. Of course we realize only too well that this situation is like that of the bilateral negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union, concerning which I said in my statement of 17 February that the Committee as such could apparently not intervene, at least for the present (CCD/PV.449, para.87). However, as in that case and for the same reasons, we believe that the other members of the Committee are in duty bound to state their opinions on this question and to urge the nuclear Powers which are members of our negotiating body to delay no longer compliance with the appeals repeatedly addressed to them by the General Assembly in its resolutions.

(Mr. García Robles, Mexico)

45. My delegation is convinced that all the resolutions of the General Assembly command equal respect and that it is not logical, much less legally justifiable, for each delegation to choose arbitrarily to cite for the purpose of our debates those resolutions that suit its own views while feeling free to disregard all the others.

46. In conclusion, I should like to announce to the members of the Committee that we shall shortly be handing to the Secretariat a brief addendum bringing up to date the working paper entitled "Establishment of nuclear-free zones" submitted by us last year and reproduced as document ENDC/241 of 24 March 1969.

47. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): I should like to take this opportunity of my first statement of this session to extend a welcome to this friendly forum on behalf of the Canadian delegation to those representatives who have joined us for the first time: Ambassador Guerreiro of Brazil, Ambassador Abe of Japan, Ambassador Erdembileg of Mongolia, Ambassador El Fassi of Morocco, Ambassador Natorf of Poland and Ambassador Datcu of Romania.

48. I wish also to associate the thanks of the Canadian delegation with earlier expressions of appreciation for the continuation of the excellent services provided by the Secretary-General, his representative Mr. Epstein, and the United Nations Secretariat.

49. I shall follow the example of most of my colleagues who have preceded me in this general discussion by confining my remarks at this stage to some considerations of a general character. The message presented by the Secretary-General reminded us of the hopes and concerns of mankind as we enter a new decade. He gave clear expression to that state of anxiety and concern about some of the implications of the arms race and of rapidly-advancing technology which was so evident in the debates of the General Assembly recently concluded, to which others of my colleagues who have spoken have also made reference. Anxiety and concern are inevitable in an anxious world; but we realize here that it is our urgent task to try to turn that anxiety and concern to constructive use, as motivation for our patient and unflagging efforts to reach effective and equitable agreements. The Secretary-General gave us a great deal to think about; and I am sure that we shall have occasion to refer to his remarks during the course of our discussions this year.

(Mr. Ignatieff, Canada)

50. It was, moreover, particularly appropriate that the twenty-fourth session of the United Nations General Assembly designated the 1970s the Disarmament Decade. We welcome the establishment of this decade for the emphasis it lays on the importance of our work in the field of arms control and disarmament, and for the incentive it gives us to achieve progress in the ten years which lie ahead. We should not, however, wish to see the idealistic concept of the Disarmament Decade, which is intended, as the Secretary-General reminded us, to accelerate our efforts, used in a manner which would result in the Committee's being bogged down in a discussion of priorities; for those, as the representative of the United Arab Republic and other colleagues reminded us at the 452nd meeting, are already reasonably clear and well established for the immediate future. It remains for us in the Committee to show progress in the fulfilment of the specific tasks which have been set by the United Nations General Assembly and in previous discussions of this Conference.

51. Surely there can be no doubt that progress on arms control and disarmament, in the interests of world peace, the conservation of man's environment and the need to be fully in control of the spreading ill-effects of technology are the three great issues facing us in the seventies. Progress on all three must be achieved if mankind is to avoid paying heavy penalties by the time we reach the eighties. Certainly the Canadian Government has recognized the issues which face us and attaches an overriding importance to the work of this Committee. As Prime Minister Trudeau stated in the House of Commons last October: "No single international activity rates higher in the opinion of this Government than the pursuit of effective arms control and arms limitation agreements."

52. However, the sombre fact is, as previous speakers also have underlined, that despite the continuing efforts made here and in New York the world rate of expenditure for military purposes remains staggeringly high. Indeed, as recent studies alluded to by previous speakers have suggested, if the present escalation continues the prospect is that the outlay of resources on arms will multiply in the next ten years with no apparent increase in national or international security.

53. Canada, as a neighbour of the United States and the Soviet Union, which outpace all other nations in the arms race, has particular reasons to be aware of the implications of that dangerous trend. Right now we are most concerned that, with

(Mr. Ignatieff, Canada)

the new development of the multiple warhead missile, mutual suspicions of preparations for military supremacy by one side or the other will tend to increase, with the result that the problems of controlling the strategic arms race will tend to increase also.

54. Canada therefore welcomed wholeheartedly the beginning of the strategic arms limitation talks last November, and earnestly hopes that those talks will eventually be successful in achieving agreements which will signal to a waiting world the first evidence of a possible slowing-down of the nuclear arms race. This is, then, a time when efforts to curb the proliferation, both horizontal and vertical, of nuclear weapons need to be redoubled. The opportunities have been enhanced through the initiation of the strategic arms limitation talks, and will be further increased if, as we very much hope will be the case, the non-proliferation Treaty (ENDC/226*) is brought into force in the near future. Once let slip, however, these opportunities may not again be easily recaptured.

55. In the case of the non-proliferation Treaty, we note that since we last met several steps have been taken towards bringing it into force. The ratification processes in the United States and the Soviet Union need only the formality of deposition of the instruments of ratification to be completed. Equally important, we welcome the ratification of the Treaty by Sweden, its signature by the Federal Republic of Germany and Japan, and the decision to sign by Australia, swelling the numbers of near-nuclear Powers adhering to the Treaty, whose support of the Treaty will largely decide how effective a measure it will be.

56. On the comprehensive test ban, the Canadian delegation is hopeful that, depending on progress over the next few months in the strategic arms limitation talks, it would be useful for the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, in its summer or autumn session, to take up the question of the comprehensive test ban, which we have consistently maintained is inevitably closely related to the strategic arms limitation talks, since continued underground testing is an outward symptom of the continuing escalation of the race for strategic weapons.

57. We hope that at that time the responses to the widely-supported General Assembly resolution 2604 A (XXIV) on the question of an international seismic exchange will be available and that it will then be possible to follow this up. The responses which are received and the degree of collaboration they indicate will, in our view, be directly relevant to the further examination by the Conference of the Committee on

(Mr. Ignatieff, Canada)

Disarmament of a possible comprehensive test ban, as well as bearing on the possibilities offered by the various threshold concepts which have been put forward in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and in the United Nations General Assembly.

58. In addition to the comprehensive test ban, a further desirable concomitant to progress in the strategic arms limitation talks will be the negotiation of a "cut-off" agreement. The entry into force of the non-proliferation Treaty will underline the imperative requirement for a cut-off in the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes. The non-proliferation Treaty, in fact, discriminates between nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States in the imposition of safeguards on the peaceful uses of nuclear energy; and that feature has been the basis of some of the criticism of the Treaty. A cut-off agreement involving acceptance by the nuclear-weapon States of safeguards on all their nuclear activities similar to those which other States are called upon to accept would remove that anomaly, greatly enhance the value of the non-proliferation Treaty, and be a real contribution towards creating confidence in the restraint of all concerned.

59. In the meantime it is the view of the Canadian delegation that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament should devote itself in the immediate future to completing the sea-bed arms-control treaty, and to the question of the elimination of chemical and biological weapons of warfare from the arsenals of nations. Progress in those two fields would represent a full agenda; in addition, the last General Assembly has given us further encouragement to proceed with this work and specific mandates in areas where it particularly wishes to see progress achieved.

60. With regard to the sea-bed treaty the Canadian position on the substance is already on record (CCD/270). We think it desirable to move now to consolidate and proceed forward from the substantial area of agreement which has been achieved and to complete our consideration of the treaty in time, not only for the twenty-fifth session of the United Nations General Assembly, but also if possible before the summer meeting of the sea-bed Committee in Geneva, so as to reduce the risk of reopening the arguments concerned with the relationship of the draft treaty to the broader questions involved in preserving the uses of the sea-bed and ocean floor for peaceful purposes which occupied so much of the time of the General Assembly at its recent session.

(Mr. Ignatieff, Canada)

61. The Canadian delegation is hopeful that, after the useful discussions on the subject of the prohibition of chemical and biological warfare last year both in this forum and at the United Nations General Assembly, progress is now possible in response to resolution 2603 B (XXIV). I can pledge the fullest co-operation of my delegation in negotiations this year on banning those terrible weapons. Canada strongly supports the draft convention for the prohibition of biological methods of warfare (ENDC/255/Rev.1) submitted to this Committee by the United Kingdom delegation. At the same time we consider we should attempt to proceed as well with the consideration of parallel proposals on chemical warfare. To this end we particularly welcome the pledge made at the General Assembly by my British colleague Lord Chalfont, and repeated to this Committee, of the fullest co-operation of the United Kingdom delegation in efforts to develop proposals banning chemical warfare and at the same time to elaborate a convention on the prohibition of biological warfare (CCD/PV.451, para.18). We think the discussions last year on that subject have laid a firm foundation on which we can now move forward.

62. In conclusion, as I have said, the Committee has a full agenda. The last session of the General Assembly has given us further encouragement to proceed with our work, and specific mandates in areas where it particularly wishes to see progress achieved. The Canadian delegation will devote maximum effort to achieving maximum results at this session of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

The Conference decided to issue the following communiqué

"The Conference of the Committee on Disarmament today held its 453rd plenary meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the chairmanship of H.E. Ambassador I.F. Porter, representative of the United Kingdom.

"Statements were made by the representatives of Italy, Mexico and Canada.

"The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Tuesday, 3 March 1970, at 10.30 a.m."

The meeting rose at 11.55 a.m.